

CU-2844

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11, 18 and 19 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 12-17 were withdrawn from consideration and by this amendment they have been cancelled, but the Applicant cancels them without prejudice and reserves the right to prosecute those claims in a divisional application.

In the Office Action, the Specification was objected to because it allegedly contained "hyperlinks." The Applicant submits that the Examiner may be confused as to the difference between a hyperlink and a URL or web address.

The inclusion of a web address in an electronic document can indeed cause a linking to a particular web site, however, when the patent is issued and printed onto paper, the addresses of web sites will not act as a hyperlink. Inclusion of web site addresses in the specification was done for the sake of providing a disclosure of where the pertinent information can be located. Nevertheless, the web site URLs that were objected to by the Examiner have been deleted from the offending paragraphs. The Examiner's objection to the Specification is therefore believed overcome.

Claims 1, 8 and 18 were objected to because they included misspellings of the word "natural." These typographical errors have been corrected.

Claims 4, 7 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 because they each included a term for which there was no antecedent basis. As can be seen above, each of these claims has been amended to delete the definite article "the" thereby overcoming the Examiner's objection to the lack of antecedent basis.

Claims 1 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,182,148 to Tout. The Examiner contends that column 5, lines 18-33 of Tout discloses steps a, b and c of claim 1 and the corresponding structure recited in claim 18. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In Tout, column 5, lines 18-33 teach the conversion or translation of information that is input to a browser or otherwise input to a computer. These lines teach that a domain name is first "traversed" to determine whether there are

CU-2844

any characters in the domain name that are not RFC1035 compliant. If such a character is determined to be in the domain name, the process assumes that the domain name is an "international domain name." The domain name is converted to UNICODE. There is simply no teaching or section in column 5, lines 18-33 of Tout to determine whether information input to a browser is either a native language pronunciation or a name language characters.

Claim 1 of the above-identified application is directed to information processing performed by a computer and includes four (4) different operations that are performed characters or symbols that are input to a web browser or other similar program in order to provide useful results to an Internet user without having to key in numerous different alphabetic characters. Steps c and d of claim 1 recite the performance of certain operations by a computer if the input to the computer is in the form of either native language characters or native language pronunciations.

The Tout reference that cited by the Examiner does not mention or discuss the input of native characters or native pronunciations nor does it teach that native characters or pronunciations can be input to a computer to find a web resource. As the Examiner knows, rejecting a claim under any section of 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that each and every limitation of a claim be found in a *single* reference. Since elements a-d of claim 1 are *not* found in Tout, the Examiner's rejection of the claim under Tout was improper and should be withdrawn.

As for claim 18, which uses means-plus-function language to claim a system that performs the functions or steps recited in claim 1, the Examiner's rejection of claim 18 on the basis of Tout should also be withdrawn for the same reason set forth above with respect to claim 1. Tout does *not* disclose any sort of device that performs the functions recited in the elements of claim 18.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tout and Maruyama et al., i.e., U.S. Patent No. 5,835,924.

As set forth above, Tout does *not* teach at least steps c and d of claim 1

CU-2844

and claim 1 is allowable over Tout. The Examiner's reliance on Tout to reject claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 19 was also improper because the limitations recited in these claims are not found in the references cited by the Examiner. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 19 should also be allowed.


Claims 4, 7, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the combination of Tout and Maruyama et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,873,982 to Bates et al.

Since each of these claims further narrows claim 1, they each therefore include all of the limitations of claim 1, which is allowable over Tout. Claims 4, 7, 10 and 11 are therefore allowable over Tout and Maruyama et al. and Bates et al.

Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 19, 2005

  
Joseph P. Krause, Reg. No. 32,578  
Ladas & Parry LLP  
224 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
(312) 427-1300